

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejection presented in the Office Action dated August 5, 2008, (hereinafter Office Action) has been considered. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowance for Claims 1, 5, 9-11, 14, 15, and 19-28.

With respect to the § 112 rejection of Claims 29-31, Applicant respectfully traverses. These claims are directed to a module of a user terminal and such a module is explicitly disclosed in the Specification at least at paragraph [0051], and is illustrated in Fig. 4. Thus, contrary to the asserted rejection, the claimed subject matter is clearly described in the original Specification. Since the original written description includes the subject matter of Claims 29-31, the rejection is believed to be improper, and Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Without acquiescing to characterizations of Applicant's claimed subject matter, Applicant has amended Claims 32-36 to be directed to a method of operation for a user terminal (Claims 32-34) and a method of operation for a server (Claims 35 and 36). Support for these changes may be found in the original Specification, for example, in Claims 1 and 19, Fig. 5 and the corresponding discussion at paragraphs [0054] through [0064] (Claims 32-34) and in Claims 1 and 27 and paragraphs [0044] through [0048] (Claims 35 and 36); therefore, the changes do not introduce new matter. Since the original written description describes the subject matter of Claims 32-36 and these claims no longer include the objected-to language, Applicant submits that the rejection has been overcome. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that Claims 24 and 29 have also been amended. Specifically, Claim 24 is amended consistent with the embodiment disclosed at paragraph [0063], and alternative wording is provided for Claim 29. These changes are not made for any reasons related to patentability and do not introduce new matter. These claims, with or without the changes, are believed to be patentable for the reasons set forth above.

In addition, new Claims 37-39 have been added. Support for these claims may be found in the Specification, for example, at paragraphs [0050] and [0051] as well as in Claim 19. Each of the new claims is also believed to be patentable for the reasons set forth above in connection with Claims 19 and 29.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (KOLS.153US) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: December 4, 2008

By: /Erin M. Nichols/

Erin M. Nichols
Reg. No. 57,125